DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 049 UD 017 408

TITLE School Desegregation in Little Rock, Arkansas: A Staff Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
INSTITUTION Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 25p.; For related documents see UD 017 402-418 and UD 017 447-452

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Integration Effects; *Integration Methods; *Integration Plans; *Integration Readiness; *Integration Studies; Race Relations; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS *Arkansas (Little Rock)

ABSTRACT

Desegregation efforts in Little Rock span 19 years. Extensive and involved efforts have been carried out by the courts, the school board, national interest groups, and the citizens of Little Rock to achieve the goal of a unitary public school system. Instead of a comprehensive approach to desegregation, a variety of conflicting plans were introduced after the initial court decision. Some were rejected, and those accepted led to desegregation by segments or grades. This piecemeal desegregation was the strategy followed until the acceptance of a more comprehensive approach in 1973. At that time, the school district and the minority community agreed to work together toward bringing about complete desegregation of the schools. The black community feels that throughout desegregation it has borne the largest share of the burden, for example, all black rather than all white schools were closed. White flight in the late 1960's has increased the degree of residential segregation in the city. Black administrators and teachers continue to complain that they receive unequal treatment and opportunity. Despite the many conflicting opinions surrounding school desegregation in Little Rock, both the school administration and the various community organizations exercised positive leadership in bringing about desegregation. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145049

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

A STAFF REPORT OF
THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION
ON CIVIL RIGHTS

June 1977

UD017408

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a temporary, independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957 and directed to:

- Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;
- Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin;
- Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Arthur S. Flemming, Chairman
Stephen Horn, Vice Chairman
Frankie M. Freeman
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.
Murray Saltzman

John A. Buggs, Staff Director

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The preparation of this report was the principal staff assignment of Charles Miles, with assistance from John F. Dulles, II, Gloria Cabrera, Mayme Williams, Ernest J. Gerlach, and Aurora Carvajal. Support was provided by Norma Valle.

The report was prepared under the overall supervision of J. Richard Avena, Director of the Southwestern Regional Office.

Appreciation is also extended to Dolores Bartning, Jessalyn Bullock, Frank Knorr, and Larry Riedman of the Commission staff for assisting in the final production of the report. Preparation for publication was the responsibility of Audree Holton, Deborah Harrison, Vivian Hauser, Rita Higgins, and Vivian Washington, supervised by Bobby Wortman, in the Commission's Publications Support Center, Office of Management.

At the appointment of the Staff Director of the Commission, all activities that contributed to this report were under the general supervision and coordination of William T. White, Jr., Assistant Staff Director, Office of National Civil Rights Issues.

PREFACE

The United States Commission on Civil Rights released on August 24, 1976, its report to the Nation: Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law: Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools.

The report's findings and recommendations were based upon information gathered during a 10-month school desegregation project. This included four formal hearings (Boston, Massachusetts; Denver, Colorado; Louisville, Kentucky; and Tampa, Florida); four open meetings held by State Advisory Committees (Berkeley, California; Corpus Christi, Texas; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Stamford, Connecticut); a survey of nearly 1,300 local school districts; and 29 case studies of communities which had difficulties with desegregation, had moderate success with desegregation, or had substantial success with desegregation.

Subsequent to the report's release, considerable interest was generated concerning the specifics of the case study findings, which, owing to space limitations in the national report, were limited to a few brief paragraphs. In an effort to comply with public requests for more detailed information, Commission staff have prepared monographs for each of the case studies. These monographs were written from the extensive field notes already collected and supplemented, if needed, with further interviews in each community. They reflect, in detail, the original case study purpose of finding which local policies, practices, and programs in each community surveyed contributed to peaceful desegregation and which ones did not.

It is hoped that the following monograph will serve to further an understanding of the school desegregation process in this Nation.

CONTENTS

I. Background..... 1
Little Rock Today
The Little Rock School District

II. History of Desegregation..... 4
Developing the "Three Year High School Plan"
Desegregating Elementary Schools, 1971-73
The 1973 Accord
Faculty Desegregation

III. Community Responses..... 9
Parents
Students
Teachers
Administrators
Media
Religious Leaders
Political Leaders
The Public

IV. Conclusions.....16

I. BACKGROUND

Controversy regarding school desegregation in Little Rock has a long history. During the late 1950s, Central High School became one of the Nation's most notorious high schools. It was the example segregationists used to argue that black and white students could never go to school together in peace. Violence in and around the school prompted President Eisenhower to dispatch Federal troops to Little Rock in order to keep the peace. Many of the scars of that desegregation effort are still present in Little Rock, yet many now feel the city has one of the most successfully desegregated school systems in the Nation.[1]

This study examines the history of the school desegregation effort in Little Rock including the factors behind its successes and failures. In addition to the legal battles, the roles of the community and political leaders, the media, the school administration, teachers, parents, and students will be examined.

Little Rock Today

Little Rock is located in Pulaski County, Arkansas. As of 1970, the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) had 323,296 residents of whom 192,523 lived in the central city area (132,483 in Little Rock proper and 60,040 in North Little Rock).[2] Slightly more than 40 percent of the population in the SMSA was concentrated in the city of Little Rock. Of the SMSA's total population, 262,698 (81.3 percent) were white and 59,770 (18.5 percent) were black. Asian Americans, Native Americans, and persons of Spanish origin constituted less than 1 percent of the population.[3]

Many residents interviewed[4] believe that one prominent result of the changing population patterns during the last 10 to 15 years has been more pronounced residential segregation in Little Rock. These persons suggest that Little Rock is now a city of "two separate and distinct societies"--a city that is racially polarized. Some community leaders noted that University Avenue is the

dividing line between the "white" western and the "black" eastern sections of the city. The western sector gained 26,000 persons between 1960 and 1970 and has a population that is 96 percent white. In contrast, the "old city," which is in the eastern sector of Little Rock, lost 12,000 of its white residents and has become more than 90 percent black. The central section of the city (which overlaps into the western and eastern sections) was a racially changing area in 1971 and is now overwhelmingly black.[5]

Little Rock is residentially segregated by race and income. A report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found a distinct relationship between race and the HUD-235 home purchasing program in Little Rock. This program to help lower income families buy homes was found largely to have supported white purchases in the suburbs and black purchases in the center city.[6] The New York Times in September 1970 described resegregation in Little Rock as follows:

> Whites have fled to the suburbs by the thousands to escape (school) desegregation and the city is building itself racial islands, black ones in the central city and white ones further out.[7]

These tendencies have continued since 1970. Thus, while Little Rock desegregated its schools, the population quietly segregated itself into two distinct communities.

The Little Rock School District

During the 1975-76 school year, there were 21,928 students attending public schools in the Little Rock School District. Overall, blacks constituted about 52 percent of the student enrollment and whites about 47 percent. Asian American, Spanish surnamed, and Native American students were about 1 percent of the total enrollment.[8] Out of a total of 1,212 teachers, faculty composition for the 1975-76 school year was 70 percent white, 29 percent black, and 1 percent Asian American, Hispanic, and Native American.[9] The boundary lines of the Little Rock district follow, in large measure, the corporate boundary of the city. The district has a total of 41 schools, including 3 senior high (grades 10, 11, and 12); 1 districtwide vocational-technical (secondary level); 4 junior high (grades 8 and 9); 3 middle

(grades 6 and 7); 9 intermediate (nongraded fourth and fifth years); 11 primary (kindergarten and nongraded first, second and third years); 4 elementary (grades 1-5); 1 alternative;[10] and 6 special schools. There are also three kindergarten programs operated by the district.[11]

The board of directors of the Little Rock School District is an independent body operating under authority granted by the legislature pursuant to the provisions of the Arkansas State Constitution. The seven members of the board are elected at large by a majority vote of the qualified voters of the school district. Currently, there is only one black member on the Little Rock School Board.

Administrative functions of the district are divided among the superintendent and five assistant superintendents who are assigned specific areas of responsibility: administrative services, instructional services, business affairs, personnel services, and pupil services. At present, there are two blacks in the upper administrative structure. At the school level, 10 of the 36 principals are black.[12]

II. HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION

A Federal district court, acting on the basis of the 1954 Supreme Court Brown decision, ordered Little Rock to desegregate its public schools in 1957.[13] The push for desegregation had been led by Daisy Bates (president of the Arkansas chapter of the NAACP) and diverse local groups such as the Black Ministerial Alliance, with the support of national organizations such as the Urban League and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

The initial effort to desegregate met with resistance from the community, the school board, and district administrators, and intervention by some State officials. This resistance was manifested in the eruption of trouble at Central High School. Wide publicity was given the dispatch of Federal troops by President Eisenhower to Central High to maintain order. The school district appealed the district court order, but simultaneously prepared a desegregation plan (called the "Blossom Plan" after school superintendent Virgil T. Blossom) for the 1958-59 school year.

The Supreme Court rejected the appeal in September 1958 in its landmark Cooper v. Aaron ruling ordering the desegregation of Central High School.[14] However, the Blossom Plan was never implemented, for Governor Orval Faubus ordered the closing of Little Rock's public schools. The schools remained closed during the 1958-59 school year.

Schools reopened in 1959 under a pupil assignment desegregation plan, in which attendance zone lines were redrawn to enhance desegregation. This arrangement was kept until 1964, when the district instituted a "freedom of choice" plan allowing students in all grades to attend the school of their choice if space was available.[15]

Developing the "Three Year High School Plan"

Because these arrangements did not produce satisfactory high school desegregation, the district considered several other schemes during the period 1968-70.

The first was the "Parson's Plan" of 1968, which provided for complete high school desegregation (primarily through paired schools) as well as for some elementary school desegregation through the creation of special school complexes in the central city. A second plan was prepared in 1969 by a team from the University of Oregon. The "Oregon Plan" was based on the use of "educational parks" where students from wide areas of the city would attend classes at a single campus. Both of these plans, according to school officials, would have been quite expensive to implement because of new school construction. Cost estimates exceeded $10 million for the Parson's Plan and $5 million for the Oregon Plan. Tax increases to finance these plans were soundly defeated in referendums.

A third desegregation proposal appeared in a plan based on geographic attendance zones. This was presented to the Federal court in early 1970 but was disapproved.

A fourth proposal called the "5-3-2-2 Plan" (five elementary schools, three middle schools, two junior high schools, and two senior high schools) was filed with the court in 1970 by the Little Rock Board of Education and would have required many children from the western part of the district to be assigned to eastern schools for 5 of their final 7 years of school. This plan would have also required approximately 1,300 additional students to be transported; the court found this plan unacceptable also. The administrative staff then prepared and presented to the board yet another proposal.

This fifth proposal, called "The Three Year High School Plan," was acceptable. This plan also produced a racial balance in all the secondary schools and offered certain advantages over the 5-3-2-2 Plan. Under the Three Year Plan fewer students were reassigned. Required teacher reassignments were reduced by about 50 percent. Central High School was retained as a graduating high school adjacent to the eastern section of the city. Athletic programs and all other extracurricular and co-curricular activities were continued without considerable disruption.

Also, the conversion of laboratories and other special facilities was minimized.

Desegregating Elementary Schools, 1971-73

While the Three Year High School Plan was being prepared, the board also developed a plan which the court approved for assigning elementary students in grades one to five. The plan was to be put into effect for the 1971-72 school year with the stipulation that the elementary students desiring to transfer from majority to minority schools would have the right to do so.[16]

At the beginning of the 1972-73 school year, the court required that the district pair and group all elementary schools to eliminate the existing dual system of racially identifiable schools.[17] The court had found the then-existing neighborhood arrangement for the primary grades to be unconstitutional because it did not achieve adequate racial balance. The school board was given until January 1, 1973, to submit a plan whereby each of the 17 racially imbalanced elementary schools would be brought within 10 percent of the overall racial composition of the district's elementary school population.[18] There were to be no elementary schools identifiable as intended for the use of students of a particular race. The district was to provide transportation for students, if necessary, to achieve this goal.[19] It was assumed that the aggregate districtwide racial composition of the elementary schools would not change as a result of this reorganization (that is to say, no white flight was anticipated). On December 21, 1972, the board of directors submitted to the court, as requested, a plan for the further desegregation of the elementary grades, to be implemented at the beginning of the 1973-74 school year.[20]

On May 9, 1973, the school board filed a motion seeking court approval to implement a kindergarten program commencing with the 1973-74 school year.[21] On June 28, 1973, a stipulation was filed by the plaintiffs and defendants in which they announced to the court that all issues raised in the further desegregation of the elementary grades and the introduction of a kindergarten program into the system had been resolved by agreement of the parties.[22] This stipulation was acceptable to the court and was signed on July 12, 1973, by Judge Henley (E.D. Ark.).[23]

The 1973 Accord

By 1973, the responsibility for further desegregation in the elementary schools had been accepted by the board of education of the Little Rock district. Also, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund approved the court-imposed pairing plan. Therefore, both sides decided to implement the pairing plan as expeditiously as possible (as instructed by the court) and jointly to select a biracial committee to assist the school board with the implementation of the plan. The board of directors and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund also agreed that for a period of 2 years beginning June 28, 1973--and for as long after that as the board adhered to its commitment contained in the plan--no further legal proceeding would be filed by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. The fund would also assist the board in any way to implement successfully the plan for school year 1973-74.

Beginning with the 1973-74 school year, all grades in the Little Rock schools were desegregated. Children from the east side were bused to 12 primary schools located in the west side of the city. Pupils in grades four and five in the west were bused to 10 intermediate schools in the east.

One additional change had been made at the high school level: In 1972 the students at Metropolitan High School were reassigned to one of the three present senior high schools so that that school could be converted into a center for vocational education serving all three school districts in Pulaski County. Little Rock students taking courses at this center were provided bus transportation.

The composite result of those actions was that enrollment at every school was almost equally divided between white and black students. Current school enrollment is approximately 52 percent black and 48 percent white.

The desegregation process was not only successful but extremely smooth, according to school and community observers. In comparison with other communities, there was little or no appreciable conflict.

Faculty Desegregation

Faculty desegregation was first ordered for the 1965-66 school year and then ordered increased for the school year beginning in 1969. In 1975-76, 30 percent of Little Rock's classroom teachers were black. Blacks constituted 18 percent of the counseling staff.[24]

III. COMMUNITY RESPONSES

Parents

In a series of Commission interviews conducted in February 1976, the most frequently mentioned concern of both white and black parents was busing. Neither white nor black parents wanted their children involved in the crosstown busing needed to implement the plan to create a unitary school system.

White parents, though concerned mostly with the busing issue, were also displeased that their children were compelled to attend interracial schools. There was general white parental hostility about completely desegregating the school system because many wanted to maintain the status quo at any cost. It was during the early 1970s that "white flight" occurred in Little Rock. Many white parents placed their children in private schools or in the Pulaski County School District (a separate district formed in 1927 by consolidating 40 rural districts).

On the other hand, some white parents were pleased with the implementation of the plan for several reasons:

- The plan reduced the actual number of white students bused.
- Some white students were able to attend Hall or Parkview High Schools instead of Central, which is in the central city and had a predominantly black enrollment.
- The children, once transferred, continued through school with their companions and thus as a group did not break up.

•Some viewed the plan as improving the quality of education by reducing the size of classes, providing better instructional materials, and restructuring the school system.

Minority parents were also displeased with busing because a higher pecentage of black students were bused than white: In the 1973-74 school year 58 percent of the students bused were black; in 1974-75, 56 percent of those bused were black; and in 1975-76, 57 percent of all students bused were black.[25] However, there was a greater concern on the part of minority parents over the loss of neighborhood schools and the inordinate transfers of black faculty; for example, in 1972-73, of 314 teachers transferred, 54 percent were black. This percentage was disproportionately high because there were fewer blacks than whites in the school system at the time (315 black teachers out of a total of 1,065).[26]

Generally, minority parents were pleased with the plan for the following reasons:

•Minority students went to better schools with better instructors and better instructional materials.

•Total desegregation was achieved within the school system.

•There was an equitable distribution of black faculty members.

Students

The reaction of the high school students interviewed was one of mixed emotions regarding desegregation. They expressed concern as to how they personally would be affected due to the desegregation process. Both black and white students cited violence in and around schools, apathy among black and white students, and discipline as the three most important problems faced by the district with regard to its students. Both black and white students also believed that the overall educational quality had increased for some students in Little Rock schools but had decreased for others. They cited a decline in the district average on national test scores as evidence of one negative effect desegregation has had on the quality of education. The

white students believed that educational quality would continue to decrease, and, because some of their parents were strictly opposed to busing, the students themselves were contemplating attending private schools.

On the positive side, the white students cited increased parental involvement in school affairs, better relationships between white and black students, the chance to meet different people, increased sensitivity, and improved educational facilities for blacks as side effects of desegregation. On the other hand, the black students believed that the opportunity for a better education for all students was attainable and that, indeed, relations between the white and black communities had improved as had educational facilities. In their opinion, the major negative outcome brought about by desegregation was "white flight" into the suburbs.

Teachers

Teachers' feelings about desegregation were mixed. In interviews with Commission staff, white teachers were generally pessimistic, and did not know if desegregation was necessary or if the plan would really work. Black teachers believed that desegregation was necessary. Both black and white teachers expressed their opinions, but neither group did anything actively to promote its views. The only participation that teachers had in the development of the final plan was through the local chapter of the National Education Association (NEA), which had limited involvement. However, individual faculty members were consulted about their transfers. Training in the areas of staff development and human relations was also provided for teachers after implementation of the plan. (During the first 2 years of desegregation, teacher-student relations were reportedly strained because of racial conflict.)

One positive change brought about by desegregation, according to those teachers interviewed, was the development of better relations between white and black students. On the other hand, there were some negative effects--for example, proportionately fewer black teachers than white ones were hired. This remained the case as recently as the 1975-76 school year, when approximately 52 percent of the students in the Little Rock School District were black, while the teaching staff was 29 percent black and 70 percent white. The involvement of the community leaders was seen by

teachers as the single most important factor that initiated desegregation. White teachers thought parental opposition was the element that most impeded desegregation in the district, while black teachers frequently cited the closing of black schools.

For the most part black teachers felt that the overall educational quality has definitely improved in the district. White teachers said that desegregation has tended to hinder white students academically, but that black students were definitely helped. White teachers said that test scores initially dropped, but are now improving because of the availability of better instructional materials and facilities. Black teachers said that more blacks are graduating from high school and obtaining jobs because of desegregation.

Administrators

School administrators were not in agreement as to the desirability of desegregation prior to implementation in the district. One administrator was concerned about how the plan would affect the overall educational quality in the district. He was also concerned about white flight from central city schools.

All those administrators interviewed agreed that the superintendent and the board of directors were primarily responsible for the development of the plan because they had taken the initiative despite the lack of community support.

School administrators cited three factors as being extremely important in implementing desegregation in the Little Rock School District: superintendent leadership, the court orders which gave details on how desegregation would be accomplished, and the creation of a biracial committee of parents and staff. When the administrators were asked, "In your opinion, what specific educational changes or programs most facilitated school desegregation?" the general responses given were the elimination of overcrowded schools, human relations training, lower teacher-pupil ratios, inservice training, and staff development programs. Those factors that were cited as having impeded desegregation were "white flight," parental opposition, and community attitudes.

To facilitate desegregation the district provided copies of the desegregation plan to the public. The district also conducted community meetings dealing with the effects of the plan and extensively utilized the media to keep the community informed.

With respect to educational quality, some administrators felt that there had been no effect. Others, however, indicated that test scores had improved and that programs for students with learning disabilities were initiated because of desegregation.

The administrators said that the most important problems faced by the district in the first 2 years were the apathy of black students and parents, violence in and around schools, and financial problems.

Every high school in Little Rock now has a biracial administrative team. If the principal is white, the vice principal is black, and vice versa. However, there are few black administrators at the central office level. According to school officials, it is difficult to recruit and retain outstanding blacks for high administrative posts given the current salary scale. The proportion of black administrators in the district has stabilized at approximately 28 percent during the last 5 years; however, total black representation on the staff of the district has risen to 37 percent for the 1975-76 school year. The underrepresentation of blacks at higher levels is more pronounced in view of the 52 percent black enrollment in the schools. Many of the blacks interviewed by Commission staff contend that the percentage of blacks at each staff level should reflect their percentage in school enrollment.[27]

Media

The Arkansas Gazette, according to Bill Lewis, its education writer, provided some of the strongest support for desegregation. The Gazette provided support beginning in 1957 with the original court order.

Religious Leaders

Generally, the religious leaders interviewed were moderately in favor of desegregation and believed the quality of education had improved since implementation. With respect to current problems facing the district, they

said that inadequate facilities and student discipline were the most serious. They agreed that, overall, the plan was working well, schools were progressing at a satisfactory pace, and race relations in the community had improved.

Political Leaders

Local political leaders, who consider themselves reasonably well-informed about the desegregation process in Little Rock, pointed out that the political community was strongly opposed to desegregation prior to its actual implementation. They believe that any opposition on the part of political leaders that now exists is due to the process of busing rather than to desegregation itself. In their opinion, the political community would rather support a change in housing patterns so that school desegregation could be achieved without busing.

The Public

Perhaps one of the most important steps taken by the district to desegregate its schools was the establishment of the biracial advisory committee to the school board in June 1973. The biracial committee made its first report to the board of directors in late April 1974. During the intervening months of work, it had deliberated on six areas of concern in school operations: cultural sensitivity in interracial relations, discipline, ability grouping, communications and public relations, instructional methods and processes, and the insufficient number of black personnel in the school administration.

Another effort to get more hands, hearts, and minds into the process of helping children to learn is the result of collaborative efforts of 18 community organizations. The primary coordinating body for this effort is Volunteers in Public Service (VIPS). This organization is funded locally by the Little Rock School District and other private organizations and individuals. The purpose of VIPS is to coordinate the use of volunteers throughout the schools. Community people who are willing to share their occupations, special hobbies, and travel experience are encouraged to become part of the VIPS special resource file. Volunteers work only in schools where their services have been requested. Among the many services they perform is an attendance calling service to make certain that children who are absent from school are at home or somewhere else known

by the parents. Other volunteers present special topics in the classroom and tutor.

Despite this public participation in the schools, many Little Rock citizens fear that a widening gap exists between the schools and the larger community because of the continuing white middle-class flight to the suburbs. Some persons fear the loss of full participation in and support of public education. Others fear the emergence of an all-black school system. Despite these reservations, citizens have a strong faith in public education, and share at least in some degree the optimism about the future of the schools voiced by school officials. In general, all interviewees felt that there was evidence of some public interest and participation through community meetings and school visits by parents.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Desegregation efforts in Little Rock span 19 years. Extensive and involved efforts have been carried out by the courts, the school board, the NAACP and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, and the citizens of Little Rock to achieve the goal of a unitary public school system open to all the children of the city regardless of race, color, or creed.

Instead of a comprehensive approach to desegregation, a variety of conflicting plans were introduced after the initial court decision. Some were rejected, and those accepted led to desegregation by segments or grades. This piecemeal desegregation was the strategy followed until the acceptance of a more comprehensive approach in 1973. At that time, the school district and the minority community agreed to work together toward bringing about complete desegregation of the schools.

The black community feels that throughout desegregation it has borne the largest share of the burden--for example, all-black rather than all-white schools were closed. White flight in the late 1960s has increased the degree of residental segregation in the city. Black administrators and teachers continue to complain that they receive unequal treatment and opportunity. Black parents dissatisfied with the unequal burden of busing have nonetheless accepted busing because it provides opportunities for their children to attend better schools.

There is a wide variance in community opinion on the merits of desegregation. The range is from open hostility and concern about the quality of the schools and education to positive assertions that desegregation has been of benefit to the schools and the city. The white majority has gradually accepted desegregation. Many persons interviewed believed that the efforts to facilitate peaceful

desegregation were helpful but could have been more extensive.

Despite the many conflicting opinions surrounding school desegregation in Little Rock, both the school administration and the various community organizations exercised positive leadership in bringing about desegregation. Although many problems still remain, the Little Rock School District has made good progress in desegregating its schools.

NOTES

1. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., Little Rock 17 Years After (New York, N.Y., 1974).

2. U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, Number of Inhabitants, Final Report PC (1)-A-5 Arkansas.

3. Ibid.

4. Staff of the Southwestern Regional Office of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights conducted interviews in Little Rock with community leaders, black leaders, school board members and other school officials, parents, students, teachers, ministers, and media representatives during February 1976. Information in this report is derived from these interviews, unless otherwise credited.

5. University of Arkansas, Population Changes and Migration in Arkansas by Color, 1950-70, Arkansas Population Analysis Series, no. 70-73, Industrial Research and Extension Center, College of Business Administration (Little Rock, July 1974), pp. 6-7.

6. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, Home Ownership for Lower Income Families, A Report on the Racial and Ethnic Impact of the Section 235 Program (June 1971), pp. 23-28.

7. Roy Reed, "Resegregation: A Problem in the Urban South," New York Times, Sept. 28, 1970.

8. Little Rock School District, Division of Pupil Services, Little Rock, Ark., February 1976.

9. The alternative school was not funded for school year 1976-77.

10. Little Rock School District, Division of Pupil Services, Little Rock, Ark., February 1976, and Little Rock School District, Administrative Policies (Little Rock, Ark., February 1975.)

11. State of Arkansas, State Department of Education, The School Laws of Arkansas, chap. 3, "School Elections," sec. 8-301.

12. Little Rock School District, Division of Administrative Services, Little Rock, Ark., February 1976.

13. Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

14. 358 U.S. 1 (1958).

15. This plan was later challenged in Clark v. Board of Education, 369 F.2d 661 (1966).

16. Clark, Decree, July 16, 1971, p. 1.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., p. 2.

19. Clark, Report of Defendants, Dec. 21, 1972, p. 51.

20. Ibid., p. 49.

21. Clark, Motion, May 9, 1973, p. 57.

22. Clark, Stipulation, June 28, 1973, p. 59-61.

23. Clark, Decree, July 12, 1973, p. 62.

24. Little Rock School District, Division of Personnel Services, Little Rock, Ark., February 1976.

25. Dr. Paul Fair, Superintendent, Little Rock School District, telephone interview, Mar. 15, 1977.

26. Dr. Paul Fair, interview, Little Rock, Ark., Feb. 4, 1976.

27. Little Rock School District, Division of Personnel Services, Little Rock, Ark., February 1976.